UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/356,505	07/19/1999	HIDEYA TAKEO	Q55129	7922

7590 03/24/2003

DARRYL MEXIC
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

EXAMINER
BHATNAGAR, ANAND P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	10

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/356,505	TAKEO, HIEYA	
Examiner	**Art Unit**	
Anand Bhatnagar	2623	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): *35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, for claim 9*.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's representative argues that the reference of Kolesnik et al. (U.S. patent 6,249,614) does not read on the claim limitations but the examiner disagrees. Applicant's representative argues in essence that Kolesnik does not teach "classifying the quantized data into data having a value representing the quantized data and at least one set of classified data representing a data value other than the representative value while obtaining classification information data regarding the classification" (paper #9 pg. 4 lines 8-11) nor teaches "coding the classification information data according to a first coding method" (paper # 9 pg. 5 lines 3 and 4). Examiner disagrees.

As to the first argument ("classifying the quantized data .....") applicant's representative refers to the the quantization unit (Kolesnik; fig. 1 elements 110) and the subunits inside this quantization unit (Kolesnik; fig. 1 elements 115,120, and 125) classify the, based on matrix correlation data, in order to pick a quantization technique to quantize the data. This is one of three types of classification that Kolesnik discloses. The other two types are performed after the quantization step. The second classification is performed on quantized data which takes place after the high correlation quantization unit (Kolesnik; fig. 1 element 120) where the ouput of this unit are the quantized coefficient matrix (read as the applicants a "quantized data") and Quantized reference coefficients (read as "a set of classified data representing a data value other than the representative value") as explained by the examiner's response in paper number 7 filed on 11/04/02. There is a further type of classification where the quantized coefficient matrix is further divided into smaller matrices and classified as zero, sparse, or a dense matrix. The examiner is applying the quantized coefficient matrix and quantized refernce coefficients which meet the applicant's limitations and not the classification that the applicant is referrring to in his argument. The quantized reference coefficients are a classification of the quantized coefficient matrix values (Kolesnik; fig. 6b, col. 8 lines 60-67 and col. 9 lines 1-8) and are "data representing a data value other than the representative value".

As for the second argument where the "coding the classification information data according to a first coding method". Applicant's representative argues that the quantized reference data "classified data" is not encoded (paper #9 pg. 5 lines 5 and 6). The examiner disagrees. Kolesnik discloses that the quantized reference coefficients "classified data" are encoded by a coding method (Kolesnik; col. 10 lines 30-35, where this coding step can be first, second, etc.) wherein there is one or more coding processes depending on the data (Kolesnik; col. 10 lines 35-38).

Therefore, Examiner refers back to the final rejection filed on 11/04/02

AMELIA M. AU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600